DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 882 HE 003 137

AUTHOR Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE Impact of Study Abroad on the American College Undergraduate.
INSTITUTION Denver Univ., Colo.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Foreign Countries; *Foreign Culture; *Higher Education; *Student Exchange Programs; *Study Abroad

ABSTRACT

The literature about the impact of study abroad on the American college undergraduate is reviewed and an experimental program instituted at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana called the Study Service Term (SST) is discussed. The objectives of SST are to give students an immersion in a foreign culture so that they may: (1) examine and experience another culture to understand and respect it; (2) live under a different government to sense different meanings of nationhood; (3) experience being in the minority; (4) develop a viewpoint necessary to live and work effectively in today's world; (5) understand through exposure to its causes the process of revolutions of our time; (6) confront desperate physical and spiritual need in a context where the possibilities of using his culture for service are apparent; (7) meet specific physical, intellectual, spiritual or other needs in another culture; (8) experience an intensive relationship as a part of a small group with 1 or 2 faculty members before deciding on his collegiate and vocational goals; and (9) contribute to a climate of international understanding and interest on the Goshen campus. The program has been evaluated as being a great success. (HS)

ED 063882

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IMPACT OF STUDY ABROAD ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE

by
Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
University of Denver

This presentation on the impact of study abroad on the American college undergraduate might well begin with what has become almost the standard opening for such reports: "Authorities in this field generally agree that there is a dearth of empirical evidence on the effects of study abroad." I take these words from a 1967 report of research undertaken at the University of California, Berkeley, under the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education. The remainder of the paragraph with which these words begin states:

> Until there are reliable research data upon which to base generalizations, we will be forced to speculate. Students mature while abroad, but it should be remembered in one sense they are simply a year older and that they would also have matured back home. The discussion that follows is based upon what is commonly believed to be the value of foreign study, recognizing that as yet there is no conclusive evidence which proves foreign study broadens the students horizons, changes attitudes, or much less, that it leads to international good will and understanding. [Gough, Harrison G. and McCormack, William A., An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad, Cooperative Research Project No. S-440, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1967, p. 29]

It appears that there have been no striking revelations of additional research during the intervening five years since 1967.

Lest I give the impression that we are wholly destitute of empirical studies of the impact of overseas experiences, let me note that Deither Breitenbach lists eight and one-half pages of studies on foreign students in his contribution to the volume edited by Ingrid Eide for UNESCO [Students As Links Between Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Survey Based

HE 003 137

on UNESCO Studies, Paris: UNESCO, 1970] This listing provides a comprehensive survey of materials published up to 1966. However, as Breitenbach points out, most of the reported studies relate to students from other countries who have resided in and/or studied in the United States. And even for these studies, most have been undertaken from 1950 on.

> In view of the significance of cross-cultural education it is amazing how long it took scholars to start taking an interest in the problems connected with it. With a few exceptions, research in the social sciences neglected the questions arising from study abroad until 1950, when the rapid expansion of international exchanges of persons, particularly in the U.S.A., gave rise to a mass of administrative and personnel problems which required an intensive analysis and evaluation of the exchange programmes. [Breitenbach, p. 71]

In his own survey, he found that 90 per cent of all of the studies dealt with U.S.A. exchange programs or were financed by the United States. Studies were conducted by the U.S. Department of State, by AID and by other federal agencies. Some few studies were undertaken by the Social Science Research Council and by American exchange organizations. Still fewer in number were those comprised by private research, theses, and dissertations. The number of studies undertaken by Europeans appeared to be severely limited.

In the same UNESCO volume, Otto Kleinberg notes in the same vein that most of the research on overseas study has concentrated on an examination of the effects of study abroad on nationals who have attended colleges and universities in the United States. Among the most significant such studies are those undertaken by the Social Research Council.

Margaret Cormack in her contribution to the Review of Educational Research, surveys recent studies on educational exchange ["International Development Through Educational Exchange," Chapter 7, Review of Educational Research, XXXVIII (1968), pp. 293-302] . But her review also concentrates

upon studies of foreign students in the United States.

> This discussion of research will be confined largely to studies of foreign students in the United States (or after their return), for this is the largest body of critical evaluation. Very few studies have been made of Americans studying abroad--a fruitful area of needed inquiry. (p. 294)

All of which would suggest that the opening quotation from Gough and McCormack is fairly accurate.

Yet, as I read Gough and McCormack and others I was not altogether satisfied that such little research had actually been undertaken. After all, the general study of the impact of education on college students has resulted in a substantial body of literature. With studies going back to the Jacob volume [Philip E. Jacob. Changing Values in College, New York: Harpers, 1957] and continuing through reports in The American College, edited by Nevitt Sanford [The American College, New York: John Wiley, 1962] and more recently in the review by Feldman and Newcomb [The Impact of College on Students, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969], surely a number of people must have examined the impact of overseas educational programs on college students. I asked two graduate students in a neighboring university to undertake a thorough review of the literature on the impact of study abroad. Using the sources at their command in the library at the University of Colorado, they came up with less than 20 different studies, and only half of these related to the experiences of college students. These are the net results of some six months of searching.

May I summarize very briefly the reports of some of these studies. Gunther Bicknese undertook three separate evaluative surveys among American undergraduates in Germany. The first was a questionnaire to compare the students attitudes and opinions before and after the junior

year in the following areas: attitudes toward Germany, integration patterns, religion, politics, use of tobacco and alcohol, sexual morality, culture, comparison of university systems, fraternities. A more subjective poll was taken to assess the effects of the program on the individual, the organizational effects of the program, the impact of travel, health and diet, and the academic aspects of the program. A follow-up questionnaire examined the problems of readjustment. [Gunther Bicknese, "Juniors in Germany: Effects and Opinions on Experimental Evaluation Through Student Polls," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC #042390]

Emily Girault in a 1964 dissertation undertook to determine whether changes in certain attitudes resulted among students who spent six months studying at the Stanford University Center in Germany. She wanted to find out what attitude changes were detectable among students on their return to the home campus and whether any of these changes appear to have endured for a period of 18 months. The students were interviewed in three groups, those about to depart for Germany, those recently returned from Germany, and those who had been back for 18 months. She examined such attitudes as: students' views of Americans and Germans, stereotype thinking, awareness of public affairs, perception of purpose in study abroad, perception of changes in themselves, reference group identification. Her general conclusions were that groups who have studied abroad are more sensitive to international problems and that overseas experience tends to reduce stereotype thinking. [Emily S. Girault, "Effects of Residency at an Overseas Campus on Some Social Attitudes of Stanford Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford, 1964.]

The Gough and McCormack study, to which reference has already been made, compared students selected for University of California study abroad programs with non-applicants and rejected applicants. The purpose was to determine whether more effective ways of selecting participants could be developed. The items that more strongly differentiated those accepted from other students was that those accepted had a strong sense of purpose in life, dedication to humanitarian and egalitarian ideas, self-reliance, and a tendency to be complex and deeply responsive individuals. The study then went on to compare various characteristics of the selected students and measurements of success in the overseas experience (success was defined in terms of peer evaluations, ratings by study directors and academic attainment). Performance seemed to be positively related to past academic performance, qualities of spontaneity, vitality, and sense of responsibility, and optimism.

John P. Gullahorn and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, began collaborating in 1954 on research concerning international educational exchange. Several articles have been developed out of their studies undertaken in the mid-fifties. In an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science ["American Students Abroad: Professional versus Personal Development, The Annals, 368 (November, 1966), 43-59], they report some generalizations based on observation, interview, and questionnaire data from 401 American students in France and interview and questionnaire data on over 5,000 Fulbright and Smith-Mundt grantees "who sojourned in all parts of the world during the ten year period from 1947 to 1957." Among their conclusions is the observation that younger students less settled in adult roles and less committed to academic goals reported more extensive

interaction with host nationals and greater personal development and satisfaction. On the other hand the older, advanced graduate students involved in research for advanced degrees evaluated their experience abroad in terms of the way in which it fostered their own professional development. Not unexpectedly, the Gullahorns pointed up that because of the different emphasis in "educational development" among various groups of students, different programs should be emphasized.

> For the younger student who is more in need of the perspective that comes from meaningful interpersonal relationships and from opportunity to 'do something' to be helpful to others (after having been in the role of the relatively passive recipient of educational aid all his life), such programs as those sponsored by the Friends Service Committee, The Experiment in International Living, and the Peace Corps might be more efficacious. Our recommendation for the Fulbright program and for other programs of <u>educational</u> exchange, therefore, is that the academic, professional goals be emphasized and that preference be given in the selection of student grantees to the more advanced graduate students whose projects appear realistic in terms of facilities and personnel in their host universities. [p. 59]

Simon N. Herman and Erling Schild have reported in several articles the research undertaken with some sixty Jewish students who spent one year in Israel in 1955. They used a series of five questionnaires, one administered before the students left New York; the second, on their arrival in Israel; the third, five months later; the fourth, at the end of the sojourn in Israel; the fifth, at the end of six months following return to the United States. In addition they chose fifteen of the group on a random basis for intensive interviews. The problems of learning and adjustment of the students in the foreign country were viewed from the perspective of a stranger in a host society. A number of hypotheses emerged regarding the process of learning in this kind of situation: observation contributes significantly to the scope of learning; direct participation

enhances effectiveness of learning; explicit communication contributes to ease of learning; however, in the matter of long range change in attitudes, participation is most effective and explicit communication is least effective. [Cf "Contexts for the Study of Cross-Cultural Education," Journal of Social Psychology, 52 (August,1960), 231-250] .

In a doctoral dissertation completed at Pennsylvania State University in 1959 Elizabeth Leonard examined the foreign study and travel program of Adelphi College. Included were 85 students participating in the Adelphi program between 1957 and 1961. She used a scale developed by P.F. Lentz, the Allport-Vernon study of values, a dimension scale used by Hilda Taba and the Ethno-centrism, Facism, and Political-Economic Conservatism scales from Adorno. She found that the students were slightly less conservative following their sojourn, that they had gained some knowledge about Europe--much of it through other than formal study, had increased in skill in foreign language, gained in self-perception and in general knowledge of current affairs. Students who participated in study abroad for one year became more "liberal" on the Lentz C-R opinionnaire than was true over a three year period of time (freshman to senior year) for students who remained on campus. [Elizabeth Leonard, "Selected Educational Outcomes of Foreign Travel and Study Program," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959]

Esther Oldt's evaluation of the Antioch education abroad program ["Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation," Antioch College Reports, No. 10, (May, 1969) Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch College] reviews several years of evaluations. A questionnaire was sent in 1964 to all student who had participated up to that point. Two hundred-sixty-one responded. Official committee examinations of the policies and operations have been made every

two to three years. One member of the Antioch education abroad staff reviewed the selection process in 1968. An earlier study was made on the effect of the education abroad program on students attitudes. The Oldt report is more a discussion of the studies underway and the analyses yet to be completed.

C. Robert Pace undertook on behalf of Sweet Briar College a study of 1,000 alumni from 1923 to 1953. The questionnaire study was supplemented by interviews with some of the members of French families where American students had lived and with some of the professors under whom the students had studied. [C. Robert Pace, The Junior Year in France, Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959] Among other things, the study revealed that those who had participated in the junior year in France were as alumnae personally more tolerant in their acceptance of people who differed from themselves, appeared to be more fully aware of significant intercultural contributions to the life of the 20th century, were more frequent and more active participants in internationally oriented activities, both of a political and cultural sort, and were more inclined to endorse policies which promote the freer exchange of ideas, goods, and people among countries.

With those brief summaries you have the bulk of the research on impact of study abroad on American college students. There must be many more studies underway or completed that have not been reported generally, but the group of studies to which I have referred fairly well represent those readily available and those to which reference is made in most articles or reviews of study abroad programs for American students. It would appear that there is still room for research in this area!

Eugene Jacobson provides a comprehensive overview of what might be involved in such research. ["Sojourn Research: A Definition of the Field," Journal of Social Issues, XIX (1963), 123-129] In his outline of a comprehensive sojourn sequence analysis, he refers to nine phases: pre-departure preparation, act of leaving, en route, entry into the area of sojourn, post-arrival orientation, exploration, tentative commitment, ultimate commitment, decision about further travel. The effect of the Jacobson analysis is to point up something of which anyone involved in this type of research should be aware, namely that clearer distinctions need to be made regarding the particular phase of the experience that is being studied. Different mechanisms may be operating within each of these phases, and while the experience is a total experience, it may be better understood through an analysis of the various parts.

In his approach to evaluation, Breitenbach [cf. Students As Links..., pp. 70 ff.] sketches five steps in an evaluation study: an analysis of the structure of the program to be evaluated, the development of research hypotheses, choosing the instruments, collecting the data, analyzing and interpreting the data. He reminds us that in any good research study there is a systematic and orderly process. Kleinberg, in the same volume, notes some of the difficulties involved in such research and suggests why judgments regarding the effectiveness of study abroad programs seem to be so mixed:

> There are in fact several sources of difficulty---first, there is a large variety of possible exchanges; second, the differences in conditions (political, economic, cultural) in which the exchanges take place; third, lack of clarity as to the goals; fourth, variation in the time span of the programmes; fifth, the limited nature of available research findings. Under these circumstances it is not too surprising that when asked his advice about the kinds and conditions of exchanges which should be developed, the social

> scientist may have to answer, 'I don't know.' He should be able to add, however, at least in some cases, 'But I can find out.' ["Research in the Field of Educational Exchange," Students As Links..., p. 50]

Kleinberg particularly calls attention to lack of clarity and dissonance in the statement of goals. Effective evaluation must be based upon some understanding of what the goals of the program are supposed to be.

While not ignoring the other suggestions relating to the nature of research on study abroad programs, let me call particular attention to the necessity for a clear statement of goals. All too frequently, the only apparent reason for an institution to become involved in study abroad is to be able to say that along with other institutions it does have a study abroad program. Under such circumstances the same vagueness that characterizes the purposes of the program is likely to characterize the operation of the program. It is not that there is any dearth of statements about the possible outcomes of study abroad; it is a matter of failure to think through the meaning of the program for the specific institution.

Irwin Abrams, in one of his earlier articles, notes that the foreign experience may help the student discover who he is and that it is almost certain to help him discover what he is. [Journal of General Education, Vol. 14 (January 1963) pp. 220-229] In a piece co-authored with David B. Arnold, Abrams sees the purpose of international education as educating young people to be able to respond with sensitivity and intelligence to a world characterized by change. The specific benefits include knowledge and understanding of the host culture and the world in general, a more objective understanding of one's own culture, and more objective understanding of one's self and values, an advance in maturity and independence. ["The American College in International Education," New Dimensions in Higher

Education, No. 27, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, April, 1967]

Battsek ["A Practical Analysis of Some Aspects of Study Abroad," Journal of General Education, Vol. 13 (January, 1962), pp. 225-242] emphasizes the social and human objectives for study abroad. In the new situation the student is more likely to develop an openmindedness and greater understanding of self and others. Coelho ["Personal Growth and Educational Development Through Working and Studying Abroad," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 55-67] points up as outcomes of study abroad: international understanding, technical and specialty training, personal growth, and general educational development.

The Gallahorns report on the objectives of study abroad as students see them ["American Objectives in Study Abroad," The Journal of Higher Education, 29 (October, 1958), pp. 369]. At the top of the list the students place the gain of professional advancement. This is followed by acquiring an understanding of the foreign culture, developing greater ability in the language, and simply having an adventure. Other objectives range all the way from being able to study under top men in one's field to seeing study abroad as a chance to escape from problems at home.

McEvoy ["Adjustment of American Youth in Cross-Cultural Programs," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 9 (January, 1968), pp. 2-8] stresses as the main possible outcome the overcoming of cultural parochialism. Stavig ["Why Study Abroad Pays Off," Saturday Review (February 19, 1966), pp. 82-86] sees as possible outcomes: a shift in perspective involving the student's view of himself and his relationship to others; the challenging of basic personal and national assumptions; the clarifying, modifying and strengthening of values. He goes on to suggest that the experience may not so much change a student as help him to find out who he is.

Without referring to a score of other articles, it seems to me to be possible to reduce the many statements about outcomes to an emphasis upon one or several of the following: developing self-awareness, gaining understanding of another culture, becoming more objective about one's own culture, becoming more sensitive to political and social issues at home and abroad, developing greater competency in a particular language or area of study.

May I now report on some research I have underway on the impact of study abroad experiences on American undergraduates. This is a progress report on what has come to be a three-year examination of the Goshen College Study-Service Term. Goshen is a four-year, coeducational, liberal arts college located in Goshen, Indiana, 120 miles East of Chicago. Current enrollment is just over 1100 full-time students. It is a private college operated by the Mennonite church, and approximately 65 per cent of its students claim membership in the supporting church.

In the fall of 1968 the College initiated a new academic program, one feature of which is a required term of study and service in another cultural setting. The Study-Service Term provides 14 weeks abroad. The first half of the term is devoted to a study of the country. During the second part of the term, students are assigned to field locations for work or service. Groups of 15 to 25 students travel each trimester to locations in Central America and the Caribbean--Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guadeloupe or Haiti and Jamaica. Groups have also traveled to West Germany and Korea. A member of the Goshen faculty accompanies each group. He is responsible for the guidance of the students, arrangements for the lecturers and language teachers, provisions for an adequate library, assigning readings and administering tests. During the first year 280 students participated.

The expenses of the 14 weeks, including transportation, are met out of the regular on-campus student charges and fees.

During 1969-70, the College asked a four-man commission to evaluate the Study-Service Term and to make recommendations for further development of the program. The team consisted of: Harold Epstein, formerly Vice President of the Institute of International Education, New York City; Henry Gleason, Professor of Linguistics, University of Ontario, Toronto; Lewis Hoskins, Director of International Education, Earlham College, Indiana (Chairman); Allan Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, University of Denver, Colorado. The commission held its first meeting on the Goshen campus in July 1969 to establish a general format for the evaluation. In subsequent visits to the campus the commission members interviewed students, both those planning to join the next units leaving for the SST locations and those who had completed their terms. The commission also asked the College to gather reports from student SST participants and faculty, review the results of a specially constructed values inventory administered by the College, and design some of its own forms to secure feedback from the students on site.

During the spring and summer of 1970 members of the commission visited each of the sites for several days. Under the schedule adopted, while no member of the commission visited all of the sites, at least two members visited each site and arranged to observe both the study and service portions of the program. Subsequently, the commission met on campus to compare notes and secure additional information from the College. The first draft of the commission report was presented to the College in the fall of 1970, and the final report in November, 1970. Subsequently the report was presented for discussion with the faculty of Goshen College

during the early months of 1971.

The general conclusion of the commission was entirely positive. The commission stated that it felt that most of the students had derived great value from the SST experience. [cf. Allan O. Ffnister, "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies," North Central Association Quarterly, XLVI (Fall, 1971), 307-313]. Without going into detail regarding this first report, may I simply note that one of the key issues that emerged during the evaluation was that of determining how Goshen might best integrate the experiential and academic. By "experiential" the commission meant the field work, the day-to-day contact between students and the people of the host country. By "academic" the commission meant the more traditional structure established for teaching and learning in the typical college setting--lectures, discussions, papers and examinations. During the study period students typically attend lectures given in large part by nationals of the host country. The emphasis is upon understanding the culture in its own terms. The lectures, given in English or through interpreters, cover a wide range of topics--history, geography, government, economics, literature, art, music, social customs, religious, agricultural and industrial development, educational systems, relations to the United States, and wild plant and animal life. The lectures are interspersed with short field trips to sites related to the lectures. Students are also required to complete a special term project, which can range from an essay on social customs to a report on family relationships or comparative study of government.

Students live with two sets of families while abroad. They live with one family during the study period and another family during the period of service. Service experiences vary widely. Some of them take on the aspects

of a modified Peace Corps experience. As a unit leader in Nicaragua reported, one of the students was "teaching just about everything" and another had "developed wonderful blisters on the palms of his hands, and is teaching rabbit and pig feeding." In Costa Rica, a majority of the group was involved in teaching English in schools, clubs and organizations, or coaching teams and leading recreational groups. Child caring institutions, hospitals and care centers occupied a large group.

It was to explore in more depth the possible impact of this combined experiential-academic experience that a second study project was undertaken in 1971. The College has listed as the objectives of SST to give students an immersion in a foreign culture in order to:

1. Examine and experience another culture in order to understand and respect it and his own culture.
2. Live under a different government in order to sense the meaning of nationhood for a country other than the participants' native country.
3. Experience being a part of a minority--racially, socially, linguistically, and religiously, to place his role in his own culture in a new perspective.
4. Develop a viewpoint in understanding necessary to live and work effectively in a world made smaller by transportation and communication facilities.
5. Understand through exposure to its causes the process of revolutions of our time: technological, industrial, political, educational and the "revolution of rising expectations."
6. Confront desperate physical and spiritual need in a context where he can see the possibilities of using his "culture for service."

7. Meet specific physical, intellectual, spiritual or other needs in another culture.
8. Experience an intensive relationship as a part of a small group with one or two faculty members before he has decided on his collegiate and vocational goals.
9. To contribute to a climate of international understanding and interest on the Goshen College campus.

The design of this second phase of the study includes elements from several of the research studies already reported: (1) responses to an opinion and attitude inventory before and after the off-campus experience, (2) a series of interviews before, during and after the experience, (3) two types of control groups, a group of students who remain on campus for a trimester who complete the opinion and attitude instrument at the beginning and at the end of trimester and a group of students in another study abroad program with some similar characteristics but lasting for six months rather than 3 months, who also complete the attitude and opinion inventory before and at the conclusion of the experience; members of this group have also been interviewed on-site.

In March 1971, a total of 59 students were interviewed on the Goshen College campus. The interviews were conducted in small groups of five or six over a two-day period of time. The interviews focused upon determining what knowledge the students had of the countries to which they were going, what they expected to receive from the program, what kind of problems they anticipated facing, and what they felt the overall value of the experience might be. The students interviewed were members of groups that would leave within a few weeks for Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Jamaica.

Each of the 59 students subsequently completed an opinion and attitude inventory consisting of 97 items measuring attitudes toward national status and security, freedom of expression, minority problems, the role of women, societal values, democratic process, campus protest, political activities. Other scales called for judgments regarding personal development in the areas of human relations, critical thinking, humanistic values and vocational values. Students were also asked to respond to a list of goals for educational institutions and to respond to a series of items relating to faculty at the institution. The items for the inventory were taken from a preview edition of Higher Education Evaluation Instruments developed by the staff of the higher education program and The Center for the Study of Evaluation at the Graduate School of Education, UCLA. The principal director of the higher education staff is C. Robert Pace.

In addition to the 59 students comprising the three groups going to Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Jamaica, 61 students, comprising the three groups going to Guadeloupe, West Berlin and Korea, completed the opinion and attitude inventory.

In June 1971, I visited and interviewed students in Managua, Nicaragua; San Jose, Costa Rica; Kingston, Jamaica. In all, I completed 59 individual interviews. The interviews duplicated in large part the interviews held on campus two months before. Each of the interviews lasted one-half hour to 45 minutes. The groups in Guadeloupe, West Berlin and Korea were not interviewed.

At the conclusion of the 14 weeks on-site, students in each of the six units again completed the opinion and attitude inventory. In September, 1971, when the students were on-campus, those in the units that had been in

Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Jamaica were once again interviewed. These interviews were group interviews involving five or six students and lasted on an average of 45 minutes. The interviews duplicated in part the questions that were asked in March and June. Fifty-nine students were interviewed.

In the period of January-April 1972, the process was repeated with three other groups. A group of 20 students scheduled to go to Costa Rica was interviewed in December, just prior to the time of departure. Members of the group also completed the opinion and attitude inventory. In February, each member of the group was interviewed in San Jose. In April, at the conclusion of the Study-Service Term, each member of the group completed the opinion and attitude inventory. Because most of the students are not on campus during the summer trimester, there was no opportunity to undertake an interview when they have returned to the United States as was the case for the three groups in 1971.

In addition, 35 students enrolled in a program sponsored by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest completed the attitude and opinion inventory before beginning work in Costa Rica. These students come from colleges constituting ACM, spend approximately 6 months in Costa Rica on the combination of study and field work. The great part of the time is spent on the field in various research projects. These students will be asked to complete the attitude and opinion inventory at the conclusion of their stay in Costa Rica. Eighteen of the students were also interviewed in February just after they had completed their period of lectures and study in San Jose.

At this time all I can provide is a progress report. As you might guess, the amount of data to be analyzed is substantial. I have made

a preliminary analysis of the responses of the six units who completed the Study-Service Term in August, 1971. I can summarize some of the interview responses for the three units assigned to Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Jamaica. The questionnaires completed by the students remaining on campus between January and April, 1972 and those in Costa Rica from January through April, 1972 have just been received and have not yet been analyzed. The final set of questionnaires from the ACM group will not be available until mid-June, 1972.

The two 1972 groups represent a type of control group. I want to find out if there is any difference in responses to the opinion and attitude inventory between those who stayed on campus and those who participated in one of the SST units. I also want to compare the experiences of the winter 1972 SST group in Costa Rica with the experiences of the summer 1971 group in Costa Rica. I want to compare the experiences of the ACM students, coming from different types of institutions and spending a longer period of time in field study, with the experiences of the summer 1971 and winter 1972 Goshen group in Costa Rica. In addition, I am comparing the experiences of the Goshen College students among the six units as well as examining the six units as a total SST group.

Let me now turn to some of the preliminary findings. First of all, what, if anything, emerged from the before and after administration of the opinion and attitude inventory? (The following statements are based on a very rough analysis. Some irregularities I discovered all too late in the computer print-outs cause me to be rather cautious about the statements I am about to make.) Were there any significant differences in responses to the opinion and attitude inventory between the first and second administrations? Using the total group of 126 students, on first

analysis, it appears that there are a number of items on which the difference in the means of the group responses is significant at the .05 level. (I say this, however, with some hesitancy, because in doing some calculations, I find slight variations in some of the means, and I would want to check further before advancing any firm conclusions.) With a word of caution, let me refer to the items in which I found what appear to be significant differences.

One of the statements to which the students were asked to respond is the following: "Government planning should be strictly limited, for it almost inevitably results in the loss of essential liberty and freedom." Students responded to the item by checking one of four columns--strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. Before SST, the average response was almost midway between "agree" and "disagree." At the conclusion of SST there appears to be a significant shift in the direction of "disagree." The preliminary interpretation would be that after 14 weeks in a different culture, students appeared more likely to disagree that government planning should be strictly limited. Perhaps being in developing countries they concluded that more government planning might be needed in order to bring about needed changes.

Another item on which there appeared to be a significant shift was the following: "Crime in the streets is a relatively small problem compared with crime or unethical practices in businesses such as false advertising, shoddy products, bribery, inside 'deals,' etc." Before the SST experience the average response was fairly close to "agree." After the experience the response moved significantly closer to "agree." It would appear that after the 14 weeks students generally tended to think of unethical practices in business as being even more of a crime than before.

Both of these items are in the general area of social issues. A third item in which there appeared to be significant shifts of opinion had to do with campus policies. The item was: "Policies on this campus regarding drinking or drugs are unfair or repressive." Before SST the students clearly indicated they disagreed with the statement. After SST, they tended to move from "disagree" toward "agree." By and large, the Goshen College students did not find relatively strict campus policies restrictive, unfair or repressive. However, after a period of 14 weeks in a society considerably more permissive than that of their own homes or the campus, they tended to move at least slightly toward questioning the campus policies.

Two other items that fall within social and political issues also appear to show significant changes in opinion. The first item is: "If the United States were not militarily strong, it would risk attack by enemy countries." The response to this question should be interpreted in the light of the fact that the majority of the students are from a historic peace-oriented religious denomination. Before SST, the average of the responses fell between "agree" and "disagree." After SST, the average moved closer to the response "agree." It would appear that after the 14 weeks the students were somewhat more sympathetic to the idea of the United States being a militarily strong country. This may be particularly significant in the light of the historic orientation of the group.

The second item is: "A society that is more concerned about law and order than about liberty and justice is basically repressive." Before SST the average of the responses was almost precisely at "agree." After SST, the responses tended to move from "agree" to "strongly agree." Students seem to be even more convinced after SST that concern for law and order is not enough.

You will recall that one of the aims of SST is to have the students make some comparisons and contrasts between their own culture and another culture and thereby gain a better understanding of their own culture and of their own government. Some 35 items on the inventory dealt with political and social issues. On only five of the items did the group as a whole seem to change significantly. Does this mean that the objective is not being realized? I would suggest that if in the short period of time there were significant shifts on even as few as five of the 35 items, this would still be indication that some changes have taken place. Most studies of this type find little or no change in opinion over such a short period of time. It remains for further analysis to determine whether these changes are statistically as significant as they now appear. And it also remains to compare the apparent changes in the 1971 summer SST group with what may have happened to students remaining on campus during the winter of 1972 and among the students going to Costa Rica during the winter of 1972.

I found it interesting that it was in another series of items that most of the changes among the students were registered. Students were asked to indicate whether they felt they had made progress in a number of respects. As developed by Pace, four scales are involved, scales purporting to measure individual judgments regarding progress in human relations, critical thinking, humanistic values, vocational orientation. There are only 16 items in this portion of the opinion and attitude inventory. What appear to be statistically significant differences in the mean responses occurred in 11 of these 16 items. Students seemed convinced that they had experienced some change in personal orientation during the 14 weeks.

The item in which the greatest change, in the opinion of the students, took place was "Awareness of different philosophies, culture, and

ways of life." Students could respond to this item by indicating whether they had made progress or benefited very much, quite a bit, some, very little. Before SST the average of the responses placed the students slightly below "quite a bit." After SST they had moved significantly toward "very much." This would suggest that as far as the students were concerned, as a result of SST they had grown considerably in awareness of different philosophies, cultures and ways of life.

The second most significant change appeared in connection with this statement: "Tolerance and understanding of other people and their views." Before SST the average of the responses placed the students slightly below the level of "quite a bit." After SST, they had moved significantly toward "very much." The students were of the opinion that they had grown in tolerance and understanding of other people and their views.

Among the other items with apparently statistically significant changes are the following: (1) "Personal development--understanding one's ability and limitations, interests and standards of behavior." The movement was from slightly above "quite a bit" to an even stronger approach to "very much."

(2) "Reasoning ability--recognizing assumptions, inferences, etc." Before SST the average response was between "quite a bit" and "some." After SST the movement seemed clearly toward "quite a bit." Apparently many of the students felt that they had made more progress toward developing reasoning ability after SST than had so indicated before SST.

(3) "Quantitative Thinking--understanding concepts of probability, propositions, margin of error, etc." Before SST students rated themselves very low on this, between "some" and "very little." After SST the average of the responses was almost clearly at the level of "some."

(4) "Ability to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas." The movement here was from the level of somewhat below "quite a bit" to a clearer designation of "quite a bit."

(5) "Writing and speaking--clear, correct, effective communication." The average of the responses before SST was fairly close to "some." After SST the average of the responses moved closer to "quite a bit."

(6) "Vocabulary, terminology, and facts in various fields of knowledge." Before SST the average of the responses was midway between "quite a bit" and "some." After SST, there was a significant movement toward "quite a bit."

(7) "Bases for improved social and economic status." This is classified as an item relating to development in vocational objectives. Prior to SST the average of the responses was less than "some." After SST the average of the responses moved beyond "some" and toward "quite a bit."

On only one item relating to goals for educational institutions did there seem to be any significant shift. This was the item: "To transmit established cultural values." Students could respond by indicating whether this was very important, moderately important, slightly important, not at all important. Before SST the average of the responses was midway between "slightly important" and "moderately important." After SST the responses moved in the direction of "moderately important." This would suggest more of an acceptance of the goal of an institution to transmit established cultural values.

The picture that emerges from this preliminary analysis is that there appears to have been some significant changes in attitudes and opinions. What is surprising to me is that these changes would emerge on the basis of grouping and averaging responses for 129 students. In many such studies, averages tend to wash out individual differences; if significant differences

appear in averages for a group this large, it would appear that there have indeed been important changes during SST.

It is, however, when one begins to examine individuals that he may be able to get a clearer insight into the significance of any changes that have taken place. By way of a rough estimate, I reviewed the chagges in responses on the 35 items referring to political and social conditions. I selected those students in which changes took place on 18 or more items. In all, 22 of the 126 students showed changes in one direction or another on 18 or more items. Some differences appeared among the group. For example, only one of the 22 students spending 14 weeks in West Germany showed this much change, while five of the 18 in Jamaica and 6 of the 22 in Korea showed changes of this magnitude. The same general pattern emerged when as a measure of "activity" I noted the number of questions on which half or more of the students in a unit changed at least one level, irrespective of direction of the change. I found that in the West Germany group, only 4 questions of the 35 showed change on the part of half or more of the students. By way of contrast, there were 11 questions on which half or more of the students in the Jamaican group changed opinion. Half or more of the South Korean group changed opinions on eight items, and similarly, half or more of the students changed opinion on a number of items among the remaining three groups. It would appear that among the students who spent the term in the developing countries more changes took place. And among the developing societies, the greatest impact seemed to be among those in the all-black society of Jamaica. The average number of changes was largest in the Jamaican group closely followed by the group in Nicaragua, Korea, Costa Rica and Guadeloupe.

Without going into further detail on the analysis, there were special points on which each of the groups differed from the others. Responses among the group in Jamaica were, for example, rather different from the responses of the group in Costa Rica. As a particularly striking example, on an item that dealt with integration, the group in Jamaica moved in one direction, while the group in Costa Rica moved in another. The item is: "In the long-run, school integration will contribute to the health of our society and to the quality of education." The group in Costa Rica moved from a position of "agree" toward "strongly agree." On the other hand, the group in Jamaica moved from "agree" toward "disagree." In both instances the Goshen College students represented a minority in a different culture, but being a minority in a black culture would seem to have carried a different effect.

Let me make one or two rough generalizations on the basis of the interview data. One of the purposes that clearly emerges among the list for most study abroad programs is that the student will gain a better understanding of a different culture. On-site, I asked each of the students what it meant to him at that point in time to have been in a different culture. Most of the students were hard-pressed to describe what was "different" or "similar" in the culture. Almost invariably each one indicated that one of the outcomes of the period abroad was that he was able to understand better what it meant to be in a different culture. But most students found it very difficult to pinpoint what they meant by a different culture. Thomas Marshall in one of the chapters in the UNESCO volume ["The Strategy of International Educational Exchange," Students As Links...] observed that it is difficult to show what it means to understand and appreciate a foreign culture. And Otto Kleinberg observes that there are clearly differences of

opinion as to what the characteristics of a particular country or culture are. [Ibid., p. 34] Students seem to have a vague sense that they are in a different culture, may see the differences during the first few days in the culture, tend to become more adjusted to them and less reflective about them.

On another item, the amount of orientation required, with very few exceptions, students did not seem to be much concerned that before leaving for the site they had very little specific knowledge about the country. After having been on-site for seven or eight weeks, they still felt very little need for orientation. Most were of the opinion that the best process is to be put into the culture, to experience it with very little in the way of anticipation or expectation. Many stated that the experience would have been much less meaningful if they had had great amounts of information beforehand.

-0-

Paper presented at meeting of National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Atlanta, Georgia, May 4, 1972.